

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-18, 32-34, and 53 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 12-16, 18, 32, and 53 have been amended herein to further emphasize novel aspects. Further, claim 34 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. A listing of all claims is found at pages 2-8 of this Response. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

In prior prosecution, claims 1-7, 9-18, 32-34, and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel *et al.* (U.S. 6,637,029) in view of Herz *et al.* (U.S. 5,758,257) and Neal *et al.* (U.S. 6,324,534). Amendments made herein, in particular amendments to independent claims 1, 18, and 53, are believed to obviate this rejection.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that a filtering component forms a temporally filtered reviewed items list that includes a subset of the logged selections of information viewed by the local users, the subset chosen to incorporate the logged selections tagged with a particular one of the plurality of time subintervals that includes a target time period for providing a recommendation, the temporally filtered reviewed items list provides implicit evidence of content preferences associated with a likely subset of the local users that employs the information delivery system during the particular one of the plurality of time subintervals. Moreover, as amended herein, independent claim 1 recites that a collaborative filtering system infers the content preferences associated with the likely subset of the local users *by utilizing the subset of the logged selections included in the temporally filtered reviewed items list as an input*. The cited references do not disclose or suggest such claimed features. Maissel *et al.* relates to electronic program guides for television systems. (See col. 1, ll. 11-13). Program schedule information can be used to assist a television viewer in choosing a television program to watch, either at a current time or in the future. (See col. 11, ll. 11-13). Further, an intelligent agent can be used to store program characteristics in a viewer preference profile, which can include information obtained over a period of time. (See col. 12, ll. 23-30). The period of time can be a few minutes, a year, or an unlimited amount of time. (See col. 12, ll. 30-31; col. 12, ll. 41-45). The intelligent agent can employ the preference profile to customize an electronic program guide. (See col. 3, ll. 5-8). Maissel *et al.*, however, is silent with regards to filtering logged

selections of information to form a temporally filtered reviewed items list or utilizing the temporally filtered reviewed items list as input to a collaborative filtering system as claimed.

Herz *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Maissel *et al.* Herz *et al.* relates to scheduling receipt of desired movies and other forms of data from a network such as a cable television system. (See Abstract). Herz *et al.* describes creating one or more customer profiles for each customer of video programs, where the customer profiles indicate customer's preferences for predetermined characteristics of video programs and can vary in accordance with time of day, time of week, and/or customer mood. (See col. 4, ll. 59-64; col. 5, ll. 23-28). Different customer profiles can be used for each customer in accordance with the time of the day and of the week, thereby reflecting changes in the customer's preferences or moods during the course of a week. (See col. 5, ll. 29-33). Moreover, each mood has a time window within which the mood is effective, where the time window has a starting point and an ending point. (See col. 17, ll. 33-41). Further, the customer can be responsible for defining the moods. (See col. 17, ll. 66-67). User definition of moods and use of these moods, however, differs from filtering logged selections of information to form a temporally filtered reviewed items list or utilizing the temporally filtered reviewed items list as input to a collaborative filtering system as claimed.

Moreover, Neal *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Maissel *et al.* and Herz *et al.* vis a vis independent claim 1 as amended. Neal *et al.* pertains to an electronic catalog search engine that uses a search process that identifies a desired item from a most advantageous supplier. (See Abstract). Neal *et al.*, however, is silent with regards to filtering logged selections of information to form a temporally filtered reviewed items list or utilizing the temporally filtered reviewed items list as input to a collaborative filtering system.

Additionally, Maissel *et al.*, Herz *et al.*, and Neal *et al.*, alone or together, do not disclose or suggest that the collaborative filtering system infers content preferences and produces the user specific recommendation by employing a *global inference system* that groups set top boxes into clusters and generates a set of recommendations for members of at least one cluster based on the temporal viewing habits of members of the cluster *and a cluster specific inference system* that determines user preferences based on correlations between users of a given cluster as recited in amended independent claim 18. Maissel *et al.*, Herz *et al.*, and Neal *et al.* are silent with respect to such claimed aspects.

Further, Maissel *et al.*, Herz *et al.*, and Neal *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest means for logging selections of information viewed by local users of the information delivery system and temporal history related to *time segments within a day* that correspond to the viewing of the selected information, *the selections of information logged for a plurality of days* as recited in amended independent claim 53. Maissel *et al.*, Herz *et al.*, and Neal *et al.* are silent with respect to such claimed aspects.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 18, and 53, as well as claims that depend there from, are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP161US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Todd Edward Behrens/

Todd Edward Behrens

Reg. No. 59,170

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731